

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

Reserve
A 249.39
Ag 8

U. S. DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

JUN 15 1964

CURRENT SERIAL RECORDS



The Incentive Awards Program

FISCAL YEAR 1962

(Revised)

United States Department of Agriculture

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
OFFICE OF PERSONNEL
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.

April 26, 1963

To: Agency Heads, Personnel Officers, Incentive Awards Officers
From: Director of Personnel
Subject: Incentive Awards Program, Fiscal Year 1962

A review of the Department's 1962 Incentive Awards Program is attached. As I read this, questions are raised in my mind which I would like to pass along to you for your reaction.

The approval rate of suggestions for 1962 was maintained at approximately the same level as in 1961. This appears to indicate a fairly constant quality level for suggestions received and that agency suggestions evaluation standards have been uniform. Minor changes in Civil Service minimum standards for accepting suggestions had little material effect on the approval rate. However, the number of suggestions received during 1962 was reduced 14 percent from the previous year which means a "loss" of approximately 850 suggestions. If a comparable number of these non-received suggestions had been approved some 170 additional quality suggestions would have resulted. This means lost manpower, money and materials. What are the reasons for this drop in participation? Does this loss reflect management disinterest? Can you and I expect employees to make suggestions without management interest, promotion and recognition? Is only lip service given to our incentive programs? Do agency incentive awards officers get the backing and encouragement they must have? Do managers give of their time and effort to publicize suggestions of merit and give individual recognition?

Some agencies surpassed their previous number of suggestions processed, others held their own, and still others' suggestion rates dropped significantly.

More employees were recognized in 1962 for performance than in the preceding years. However, compared with several other agencies and departments of government, Agriculture drops behind in recognition of outstanding performance. A goal of 50 percent increase in recognition

would show we recognized performance of our employees as compared to other agencies. If the number of employees per thousand who were approved in your agency was below 50, should you not look seriously at your program? We are not in a numbers game, but we want to recognize every deserving employee. It should be noted that some agencies rewarded their employees well above the suggested figure.

The total dollar benefits of the suggestions received varied considerably. Though these figures for 1962 are significantly lower than in 1961, it is recognized that one or two suggestions with considerable dollar benefits affect the figures. One suggestion from an agency could more than support the entire awards program. As mentioned earlier the paper loss of 170 suggestions this year might have included such a suggestion. Tangible benefits are important to us but should not obscure the many intangible benefits derived from hundreds of suggestions.

First year dollar benefits arising from employee performance reflect a substantial increase over 1961. However, it is noted that some agencies reported no first year dollar benefits were realized even though substantial numbers of performance awards were given. It would appear supervisors are hesitant to recognize employees when the performance is based in whole or in substantial part on dollar benefits.

The 1962 Honor Awards Program paralleled that of the previous year as would be expected. Some Task Force suggestions for further improvement of this program are now under consideration.

My staff and I are making and will continue to make every effort to improve the Department's Incentive Awards Program. We seek the full support of all agencies. The recent delegations of authority in the awards area should help you in development of improved programs. Your personal participation in your agency's awards program is vital.

May I have your reactions to the thoughts in this letter?

Carl B Barnes

EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTIONS						AGENCY			
SUGGESTIONS				PERFORMANCE				SUGGESTIONS	
Number Rec'd	No. Per 1000 Employees	Number Adopted	No. Per 1000 Employees	Number Approved	No. Per 1000 Employees	Ave. No. Full-time Employees		Number Awards Granted	Amount Paid in Cash
246	34	63	9	230	31	AMS	7,327	62	3,080
709	42	172	10	385	23	ARS	16,871	137	4,275
802	96	311	37	254	30	ASCS	8,362	307	13,327
3	24	2	16	10	80	CEA	125	2	40
0	0	0	0	1	10	CSESS	100	0	0
12	13	6	7	36	40	ERS	892	6	270
5	6	0	0	67	80	FAS	837	0	0
33	66	7	14	14	28	FCIC	501	5	450
6	57	7	66	7	66	FCS	106	5	180
4	17	2	8	32	135	FES	237	2	500
643	133	127	27	94	19	FHA	4,821	112	3,470
1,356	58	462	15	283	12	FS	23,389	353	13,138
6	23	2	8	1	4	INF	257	2	515
5	33	1	6	5	32	MOS	155	1	75
4	25	2	13	7	44	NAL	159	2	30
29	73	7	18	20	50	OGC	397	7	235
61	64	23	23	33	34	REA	960	23	465
1,528	103	381	26	1,145	78	SCS	14,724	219	8,015
39	89	5	11	8	18	SEC	437	5	115
17	19	10	11	13	14	SRS	900	10	375
5,508	68	1,590	19	2,645	32		81,557	1,260	\$48,555

MENT OF AGRICULTURE

AM - FISCAL YEAR 1962

(REVISED)

C A S H A W A R D S							H O N O R A W A R D S		
	P E R F O R M A N C E			T O T A L S					
st Year lar efits	Number Awards Granted	Amount Paid in Cash	First Year Dollar Benefits	No. Cash Awards Granted	Amount Paid in Cash	First Year Dollar Benefits	Dist.	Sup.	Tot.
4,620	209	38,845	0	271	41,925	14,620	1	12	13
1,228	354	75,990	912,708	491	80,265	923,936	2	22	24
4,211	251	55,355	9,155	558	68,682	143,366	0	9	9
0	10	2,100	0	12	2,140	0	0	0	0
0	1	200	0	1	200	0	0	0	0
428	32	8,450	0	38	8,720	428	1	3	4
0	50	10,850	0	50	10,850	0	1	4	5
0	11	2,000	0	16	2,450	0	0	0	0
569	6	1,500	0	11	1,680	569	0	1	1
0	13	2,703	0	15	3,203	0	0	19	19
3,477	90	15,741	0	202	19,211	3,477	0	6	6
05,690	250	46,110	0	603	59,248	305,690	2	19	21
0	0	0	0	2	515	0	0	1	1
0	5	1,100	0	6	1,175	0	0	0	0
0	3	440	0	5	470	0	0	1	1
0	19	3,700	0	26	3,935	0	0	1	1
1,058	31	7,450	0	54	7,915	1,058	0	2	2
8,059	678	121,518	150	897	129,533	38,209	1	17	18
0	5	945	0	10	1,060	0	0	1	1
0	12	2,575	0	22	2,950	0	0	3	3
09,340	2030	\$397,572	\$922,013	3290	\$446,127	1,431,353	8	121	129

INCENTIVE AWARDS PROGRAM - FISCAL YEAR 1962
(Rounded Figures)

Tangible Savings from <u>Adopted Suggestions</u>	<u>\$509,000</u>
---	------------------

(Seventh among Federal departments - about average for the number of employees in USDA and its programs)

Tangible Savings from <u>Superior Performance</u>	<u>\$922,000</u>
--	------------------

(Sixth among all Federal departments - a bit above average for the Department's size and its programs)

Suggestions Adopted per 1,000 employees - USDA	19
<u>- All Federal</u>	<u>45</u>

(More suggestions might close the gap next year. There is a quantity quality relationship)

Average Cash Award for Suggestions - USDA	\$39.00
<u>- All Federal</u>	<u>\$40.00</u>

(Here Agriculture is in the middle of the road)

Superior Performance Awards per 1,000 employees - USDA	32
<u>- All Federal</u>	<u>33</u>

(Other departments had 83, 55, 52, 50, 49, etc. Surely, their employees are not superior to those in Agriculture. Don't short change the deserving employee)

Amount of Cash for Performance Awards - USDA	\$196
<u>- All Federal</u>	<u>\$149</u>

Well, at least we're generous when we do recognize superior performance.

INCENTIVE AWARDS PROGRAM RESULTS

	<u>Fiscal Year 1962</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 1962</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 1962</u>
A. SUGGESTIONS:			
Number received	5,508	6,124	5,129
Rate per 1,000	68	77	67
Number adopted	1,590	1,777	1,666
Rate per 1,000	19	22	22
Number Cash Awards	1,260	1,439	1,373
Amount Paid	\$48,555	\$57,765	\$53,000
Tangible Benefits	\$509,340	\$4,225,691	\$647,689
B. PERFORMANCE CASH AWARDS:			
Number	2,030	1,866	1,827
Amount Paid	\$397,572	\$354,561	\$348,665
Tangible Benefits	\$922,013	\$576,277	\$47,920
C. HONOR AWARDS:			
Distinguished Service	8	7	8
Superior Service	121	99	94
<hr/>			
D. TOTAL CASH AWARDED	\$446,127	\$412,326	\$401,665
TOTAL TANGIBLE BENEFITS	\$1,431,353	\$4,801,968	\$695,609
Average Employment - Full-time*	81,557	79,019	76,738

*This figure is weighted heavily as it is computed on a 13 month average, June through June, and includes temporary employees. This adds 448 + 8,957 = 9,405 to average employment in 1962.

